

In the drawings:

In Figure 3, delete the line extending from the block 40 labeled COMBINE CHROMATICITY & LUMINANCE to mid-way of the block 39 labeled SUBTRACT CORRESPONDING COORDINATES and add a line extending from block 39 to new end of the line extending to block 41 labeled SQUARE DIFFERENCES AND SUM, as shown in red on the enclosed correction sheet. A replacement Figure 3 is also enclosed.

**REMARKS**

The specification has been amended to correct typographical errors (page 4 line 18 and page 12 line 6) and to delete an incomplete sentence (page 5 lines 3-5). The incomplete sentence is incomprehensible and its removal does not add or detract from the text.

Figure 3 of the drawings has been amended to eliminate incorrect indications of action flow. Justification for these corrections may be found on page 6 lines 4 -15, where the description of the activity flow is consistent with the figure corrections.

The claims have been amended to succinctly recite what applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 3 - 16, and 18 are in this application.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations previously recited in now canceled claim 2 and to specifically recite that the evaluation parameters are determined with the utilization of the chromaticity the display and target colors. Justification for this amendment may be found in the specification on page 6 lines 3 - 14.

Claim 3 has been amended to be dependent from claim 1 and to specifically recite the comparison of the evaluation parameter for the response color to the evaluation parameter of the target color. This amendment is supported in the specification on page 6 lines 10 - 17 and provides a better description of the invention than previously recited.

Claim 7 which recites steps in "another performing" step has been amended to be dependent from claim 6 wherein the "another iteration" performing step is specifically recited.

Claim 11 has been amended on line 2 to correct a misspelling.

Claim 14 has been amended to incorporate therein the limitations of now cancelled claim 17.

Claim 16 has been amended to specifically state that the processor "further" includes a light sensor.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 due to the lack of an antecedent basis for "said another iteration" recited therein. By the amendment made herein, claim 7 is now dependent from claim 6, wherein the step of "performing another iteration" is specifically recited. Consequently, claims 7 and 8, which depends from claim 7, now satisfy 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6,677,958 issued to Cottone. While Cottone discloses a method for calibrating a display system, he does not teach or imply the method recited in now amended claim 1.

Claim 1, as amended, specifically recites the determination of evaluation parameters for the color displayed on the screen and the target color with the utilization of their chromaticity and luminance values. The establishment of evaluation parameters utilizing the chromaticity and luminance values is not taught or implied by Cottone.

In view of the above, Applicant contends that claim 1, as amended, recites a novel and patentable contribution to the prior, that claim 1 and claim 3, which depends and draws novelty from claim 1, are in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Application 20030210221 filed by Aleksic. Claim 14 has been amended to incorporate therein the limitations recited in now cancelled claim 17, which has been rejected as being dependent from a rejected base claim. Consequently, claim 14, as amended, is claim 17 written in independent form.

In view of the above Applicant contends that claim 14, as amended, and claims 15 and 16, which depend and draw novelty from claim 14, are in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over


Cottone in view of Aleksic. Claim 11 depends and draws novelty from claim 1, which as amended, is now allowable claim. Consequently, claim 11 is also an now allowable claim.

Claims 4 - 6, 9,10, 12, and 13 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. These claims now depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, which as stated above is now an allowable claim, and therefore are now allowable.

Claim 18 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. This claim depends from indirectly from claim14, which has been amended to be claim17 in independent from and as stated above is now an allowable claim. Since claim 14 is allowable claim, claim 18 now depends from an allowable base claim and is therefore allowable.

It is respectfully submitted that Applicants have responded to each and every issue raised by the Examiner in the Office Action of June 7, 2006 and that the claims, as amended, now in this application recite novel and patentable contributions relative to the prior art. Accordingly, favorable consideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Seymour Levine

Registration No. 27,713


2C Chateaux Circle

Scarsdale, NY 10583

Phone (914) 472-9899

Fax (914) 472-1646

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on August 20, 2006.

  
Seymour Levine

August 20, 2006  
Date Signed




FIGURE 3